

In the last number of "THE DEMOCRATIC REVIEW," the received exponent of the theoretic and doctrinal politics and literature of the "Democracy," so called, there appeared an article (its leader) on "the Mexican Question," so remarkable in its character and language that we were about to point to it the reprobation of every right-minded citizen, when, to our surprise and shame, in that very moment, the newly-established organ of the Executive adopted that article into its columns, accompanying the publication with the following commendatory notice:

"MEXICO.

"The idle complaints and the blustering menaces of Mexico must now be exposed. We have opened the merits of the Oregon question. We must now proceed to Mexico. We commence the discussion this evening, by publishing the first part of a very able paper on the Mexican question, being the first article of the May number of the 'Democratic Review.' We shall finish it to-morrow, when we shall commence a series of original articles on this subject prepared for 'The Union.'"

The words "we commence the discussion," &c., clearly declare the intention of the government paper to make this article its own; and since, so adopting it and commending it at large, it takes no exception to its tone or terms, it cannot be held to do any less than to assume for the Administration the language, equally without precedent or excuse, which we are about to cite. All this is the clearer, because the *Union*, it will be perceived, indicates that this, and a series of articles furnished to it by a contributor, will form—as they have yet formed—its sole regular discussion of the Texas question.

Like one who thinks that the instigators of a public enormity, the instant they have committed (though not yet consummated) it, acquire the right to stigmatize as recreants and traitors all citizens who, having strenuously and loudly opposed to what they believe to be a great wrong, cannot cease to denounce it until it has become fixed and irretrievable, the Review sets forth as follows:

"THE MEXICAN QUESTION.

"It is an ill bird that fouls its own nest. He is a bad patriot who is seen to make it an object of eager passion to degrade and disgrace his own country, and his country's Government, not only in the eyes of our own people, but of the rest of the world—not only of those engaged in controversy with us on the point at issue, but of that envious step-motherland ever scowling malignantly upon us with evil eye from across the water; keen for the discovery of every occasion for a sneer, quick to seize it, and bitterly scornful in pushing it to its utmost possible length of insult against us, and disparagement of democratic institutions."

"The annexation of Texas is a measure which industrious arts of misrepresentation and sophism have labored to pervert into an act of national rapacity, spoliation, and bad faith—aggravated by the comparative weakness of the poor neighbor who is the object of the impugned wrong. In the relations of private life, a similar charge would certainly be one which an honorable self-respect would repel with the most sensitive indignation. The honor of our country surely should be no less dear to each of her sons not wholly unworthy of that parentage. We acknowledge, therefore, a sentiment not far removed from the justness of the just meed of all treason, when we see a portion of the American press itself teaching to the foreigner this language of outrage against our own national honor—or pleading guilty to the charge in the name of the country, for the sake of maintaining a partisan argument or partisan clamor against an antagonist party ascendant in the Government. To the American in Mexico or in England, reading in the journals of those countries copious extracts from the papers of his own, stamped on every line with the unapologetic moral treason, and fully sustaining the worst that can be even pretended by our worst enemies there—by a testimony paraded as the confession of the party criminated—there can be but little consolation in the reflection that these are indeed American journals, from whose columns such insulting citations are thus flouted in his face."

"In truth, this traitorous anti-Americanism has been dealt with all too leniently. Too much indulgence has been extended to that which may perhaps have been honest difference of opinion before the action of the country became decided and committed, but which, after that time, lost its right to a similar charitable construction and treatment."

Such, then, on a great public question, not yet settled, and involving not merely the reputation, but too probably the ultimate peace and union of the country, immense personal interests, a vast body of patriotic feeling, a powerful mass of intelligent and honest dissent, the deepest convictions that the measure is a fatal blow to constitutional security—such, it appears, is the language which the recognized organs of the Administration have the effrontery to apply to their fellow-citizens.

"Treason!" Treason, we repeat, in the teeth of the slanderer who earns perhaps a foreign mission, a rich consulship or collectorship at least, by such opprobrious aspersions of the best and noblest spirits whom the land can boast! TREASON (thank Heaven!) is defined by the Constitution, or under the rule of such men as those who profess and sustain the doctrines of the Democratic Review, the office of executioner for the offence of treason might be made one of the most lucrative in the Government.

"Treason against the United States," says the Constitution, "shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." "Treason," under this Government, therefore, can exist only during war; and the imputation of treason to citizens of the United States when there is no war, is the mere drivelling of fools, or the contrivance of designing knaves. Yes, thank Heaven again! Treason is defined by the Constitution; and when the makers of that Constitution so defined it, well they knew what they were about. They knew what crimes against liberty ambitious "Democrats" or ignorant demagogues would be too prone to perpetrate under the pretence of punishing crime; they knew, and they gave it as a reason for opposing to this peculiar danger the barrier of the definition of treason, that "new-fangled and artificial treasons" have been the great engines by which violent factions, the natural offspring of free governments, have usually wreaked their alternate malignity on each other. What wisdom, and what forecast, guided all the deliberations and all the actions of that band of sages who framed the Constitution! With what a prophetic eye they looked into the future, how powerfully attests this infamous pretension of the organ of "the Democracy" to brand all difference of opinion from it as "traitorous and anti-American!"

It is easy to see that the Review has forgotten that a bitter and denunciatory opposition to Annexation was by no means confined to the Whig party; and that the opprobrium which it (the Review) would deal, if since echoed by an organ which the Administration has set up, must strike many a lofty head besides Whig ones, and smite a majority of its own very party to the earth.

[Letters of PERCIVAL, No. 43, by JAMES MADISON.

"Moral treason," truly! Did we ever think to live to hear this abominable heresy in free government actually broached? Twice before in our history has its horrid roar been heard; erst during the quasi war of 1798, and last in the epoch of 1812, when—though in the midst of the excitement of a raging war—even then, it was fairly hooted out of the House of Representatives, the author of it flying before the storm which he himself had raised. In a free government, the term "Treason" can have no application whatever, as we have shown, except during war; nor even then can it have any rational application to the freest use of speech or printing. If such an epithet as "Moral Treason" could ever apply, when could it apply with more propriety than to those Democratic Reviewers, and their chorus of echoes, proclaiming deadly war against the most sacred principles of the Constitution—those which protect the freedom of speech or of the press? These are principles which none but an anti-Republican, or a zealot intoxicated with the fumes of power, would ever think of openly assailing.

"Treason," indeed! If the Review and the government paper insist on the applicability of this term to existing circumstances, we will tell those organs of the democracy who, in time of peace, are the real traitors. Not they who endeavor, by such means as truth and reason afford them, to restrain wicked or willful public servants, of high or low degree, from breaking the national faith, from interfering in the intestine broils of other nations, from court-jurying and fomenting war, with all its train of horrors, sufferings, and corruptions; but those very public servants who exert themselves to accomplish these purposes, and such abettors as the writer for the Democratic Review and other organs of the Administration, who "cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war." The country can have no greater or more dangerous enemy than he who would wickedly avail himself of political power to involve it in war. He who during peace comes nearest to the definition of "levying war against his country," is he who designedly and needlessly places his country in a position which he knows will make war inevitable. He is the "moral traitor," could such an epithet, applied to any body, excite any other emotion than the scorn and contempt to which, after saying thus much, we willingly consign it.

But whom, in this more than semi-official denunciation of all who, contending against annexation, in its origin and progress, as a measure disgraceful and impolitic, must continue to oppose to it to the end; in this hurrying upon them, almost from the Presidential seat, the foul and monstrous epithet of "moral traitors;" that is, of *traitors in every intention*—in all the feelings and purposes of men who are bent on betraying their country, and have only not yet arrived at the occasion of the overt act that make *legal treason*—whom, in effect, does the Review adopted by the Administration stigmatize?

It stigmatizes, first of all, nearly one-half of both branches of the Legislative power, co-ordinate with that of the Executive, and barely carried to vote the measure by the application of all the influences of party, and the expectation, if not the direct promise, of Executive honors to members who would violate the known wishes of their constituents. In the Senate, eleven (it may be said) who had, by their action some eight months before, condemned the whole plan and project of annexation as disgraceful in its conduct, corrupt in its motives, impolitic and wrongful in its objects, and against the Constitution even in the more legal form then attempted, came over to that side, several of them against the known wishes of their people. But two in particular, as if to make signally ridiculous their own favorite party doctrine of the sanctity of legislative instructions to Senators, were vehement and fierce against annexation while uninstructed, and voted for it as soon as formally directed, under the seal of their Legislature, to continue their opposition! Now, if they who respected their own pledges and opinions, and held to their convictions or the wishes of those for whom they spoke, are *traitors* for the fact, then Messrs. Allen and Tappan, and all who could sacrifice every thing to party or to the hope of personal advantage, are the *sole true men*! For, of opposite actions, if one is signally bad, the other must be as admirably good.

Of what happened in the other House—the profligate accession of whole delegations of Democratic members, who had originally sustained Mr. Van Buren, the anti-annexation candidate for the Presidency, or the shameless wheel of many who had, in the debate itself, bitterly opposed the whole thing, the same must be said. They, too, would have been traitors, had they persisted in consulting either conscience, or constituents, or consistency; but, disregarding all these at the whistle of party or the beck of personal interest, they became, in common with the original projectors, patriots the most shining!

But upon what great public body must this attainder of treason next fall? Upon that very assembly, to the intrigue-born distractions of which alone the President owes the very elevation which gives consequence to these declarations in his name! A popular nomination to the Presidency had never been thought of for him, even by any local circle or the suggestion of his name even for the honor (now so cheap) of the Vice-Presidency had been treated with exceeding disrespect. Need we repeat the story or recall the scenes of the Baltimore Convention, or say how at last there—with Mr. Van Buren nominated by seventeen States, including the four largest—with nearly two-thirds of all the delegations instructed in his favor—this Texas question was used by what can be called only a personal cabal to defeat him? That cabal, the followers of Mr. CALHOUN, were bent on destroying the nominee who, in spite of all their schemes, had borne off from their leader a large majority of the votes. Aided by the still greater treachery of certain instructed but false adherents to the nomination, they brought about that monstrous and incredible trick, the two-thirds rule; defeated him who was unquestionably not only the true popular nominee, but the fair choice of a very large majority of the Convention; and foisted every other nomination, until, apparently in mere despair of any body, they took Mr. POLK. But, at all events, almost two-thirds of that very body which placed Mr. POLK where he is, preferred a candidate who had, as President, pledged himself and this assenting nation to Texas and Mexico, "that the United States would never receive Texas while Mexico chose to continue the war; that they would maintain to the last a strict neutrality; and that 'for us to receive Texas while at war was absolutely and inevitably to declare war against Mexico.'" Even putting out of view Mr. Van Buren's anti-annexation letter,

(already promulgated), as an electioneering document, they who thus supported him, and the people who chose them to do so, deliberately preferred to all others a man thus solemnly, officially, and historically committed to that *very truth*, for continuing to sustain while the Whigs and all other recusants of such monstrous acts as the usurping political resolution are now officially branded as traitors!

What! is a thing which, in its most legitimate form, enlisted such just and indignant opposition, to disarm the dislike of all true men—nay, to conciliate at once their support—because, by resorts as wrong as the object itself, it has not only accomplished the first step in what is so dangerous and wrong, but to do this, has demolished one-half the Constitution? Is it expected, nay, arrogantly required of us, that we shall, for the fearful means employed, grow fond of the wrong sought to be accomplished?

But this adopted outlawry, this official ban against a large part of the country, (what part we will presently say), besides being Democratic, must now be deemed governmental, for it has now the Executive stamp and image upon it. Let us look, then, for an instant abroad to one of those regal Governments, with the names of which Jacobinism is so sure to conjure the people whenever it would, by flaming out against despotism, prepare the success of some bad act of its own. In kindly Britain and arbitrary France, how is it? In the latter there is a party who look and have always looked upon the war in Africa as unwise, bad, kept up by the Government only for the purpose of shipping off the unemployed spirits who would impede its own designs of usurpation; and all this they use no ceremony in saying wherever they like—in print, before the people, or in the Chambers, under the very nose of the King's Ministers, and with all a Frenchman's vehemence. Nor is this all: there was a time, some six or seven years since, when, upon the disclosure of certain letters of his Majesty, the King himself was fiercely attacked, as the Prime Minister was about the same time branded, for little less than a traitor to France. "Well, that being a monarchy, of course there was great hanging, was there not?" Not at all. True, Louis Philippe was there, and a manful one; but, probably through mere forgetfulness, or perhaps from absence of mind, he appears never to have thought of it. "But that must have been because his royal tastes prefer shooting." No, we can assure you; not even a blank cartridge was fired about the thing. "Ah, we conceive now; he thought it better to banish some, imprison others, whip a number, set some in the stocks, and fine the rest execrably." No, indeed; for he neither imprisoned, nor banished, nor scourged, nor fined, nor even indicted any body.

"But, Heavens! how he must have thundered out upon them through his organs, and called them—worse than the organ of this Administration calls the anti-annexationists!" What worse than "traitors" could he call them? If you know any such word in the English, we can assure you that there is none in French. Then, as to his "organs," we can inform you that he has none, and knows that were he to set one up with the public money it might go very hard with him. A King of France, not being able to help himself with those all-excluding words "Liberty," "Democracy," is obliged to stick to the laws, that the laws may uphold him. And, as to calling the Opposition "traitors," because they dislike some of his measures, the King of France has sense enough to know that such language, at once indecent and impolitic in a Government towards its citizens, would make people think none the worse of those he employed it against, and any thing but the better of his royal person and ministers.

"Well, we give up as to France, for we know your Frenchman is constitutionally polite." Nay, not always, as you see; for, in politics, the Opposition is considered at liberty to be very rude and bitter, if it thinks there is cause: it is only the Administration that is looked on as bound to be civil, because it is in power; to be dignified, because it is in office; and to treat the citizens with respect and attention, because it is responsible to the Public, not the Public to it.

But how do you think it is in England, that Government, as the "Democratic" calls it, of an even step-mother, scowling malignantly upon us with her evil eye? "Oh, we know all about that, and are sure the Duke of WELLINGTON and all his aristocratic lords it as they like, and treat every body that oppose them as rogues and rebels." Favor us, then, with some instances. "We confess we can't think of any just now." Allow us, then, to help you to one or two.

LORD PALMERSTON and his party (the present Opposition) have, you know, bitterly denounced the Ashburton Treaty as a betrayal of the rights, interests, and honor of Great Britain. Though now an irretrievable act, complete on all sides, and herein entirely different from the Annexation, they still continue to denounce it and its authors. How does the Government answer? Does it vituperate them back? By no means: it quietly and decently vindicates its measure.

Again: the repealers in Ireland have been busy for several years in an agitation which may well be considered as really meant to bring about the dismemberment of the British empire. It is so viewed in this country universally; and beyond doubt the British Government and a large part of England look on it as having plainly that purpose. Nevertheless, the Whig party there (many of them very Locofocoish people, who are captivated with O'Connell as some are here with Dorr) favor the Agitators and act in a sort of Parliamentary league with them. Now, has the Administration, or the great Duke, or the Queen, or Prince Albert, or even one of the Princes-in-pink-aforesaid, thought of questioning any British subject's right to speak as he thinks about O'Connell and Repeal? Does the Government denounce any body for his course about the matter? Not a soul. And yet certainly this Irish question is as dear, as capital to the integrity and peace of the British empire, as the most extravagant devotee of "annexation" has ever imagined that this last is to us.

We have spoken, thus far, only of masses and public bodies. One other point—that of the numbers that must be included in this denunciation of treason. We shall speak by facts, as ascertained; and we are not to be answered, nor the President to be defended, with mere suppositions.

Nearly two-thirds of the Locofoco party were in favor of a Presidential candidate committed to peace, to neutrality, to the non-seizure of Texas. A little later, the whole Baltimore Convention concurred cordially in the nomination of a Vice President

(Mr. WRIGHT) committed in the same way. All, or very nearly all, the Whig party must be taken as the opponents of Annexation: and we presume that the Abolitionists, no matter what the effect or motives of their vote, must be set down on the same side. Here, then, are the elements for a very easy calculation of the number of "the Traitors." They were near two-thirds of the Locofocos, all the Whigs, all the Abolitionists. But the Locofocos proved, in the election, to be less than one-half the voters of the United States: one-third of them is therefore one-sixth of the voters: so that here we have an Administration adopting the reasoning of a paper which stigmatizes only FIVE-SIXTHS of the people as TRAITORS!

Thus much for the Domestic aspect of the article of "the Democratic Review," upon the ground of which, through its acknowledged organ, the Administration has taken its stand. We reserve for another day what we have to say upon other aspects of that article.

IMPORTANT TO PATENTEES.

COMMUNICATED FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

It has heretofore been held in the Patent Office, that under the seventh section of the law passed on the 3d March, 1839, the sale of a newly invented article by the inventor, or with his consent, before he applied for a patent, would not invalidate it, excepting such sale had been made for more than two years prior to such application, or excepting on proof of the abandonment of such invention to the public. But, by a letter just received from an intelligent gentleman in New York, it appears that, on the 13th instant, in the Circuit Court of the United States, in the case of James Wilson vs. Austin Packard, it was in evidence that Wilson had sold a stove, the right to which was in controversy two months prior to his application for a patent therefor. On this testimony it was ruled by Judges NELSON and BETTS that, if the inventor sells the article which he has invented in the usual way, or if he authorizes another to sell it, he abandons it to the public. That the sale, in the usual way, in a single instance, is a dedication of it to the public. That it is not a question whether the inventor intended to abandon it to the public, but merely what he has actually done. That the idea that a person can sell the thing invented without an abandonment to the public is an absurdity. That if the jury was satisfied that the plaintiff had thus sold, in one instance, before he applied for his patent, they should find for the defendant.

It is to be hoped that an appeal from this decision may be made to the Supreme Court, in order that it may be either confirmed or reversed. What was the intention of those who framed the section of the law in question is well known to the writer of this article: in many instances men had labored long and exhausted their means in bringing a machine to perfection, and, by selling this individual instrument, they could procure money enough to enable them to obtain a patent, but, under the then existing laws, such sale amounted to a forfeiture of their rights. It was really supposed by the uninformed that the law had been changed in this particular, but it now appears that the attempt to do so was a failure, and that the Commissioner of Patents and others filling important stations in the Patent Office have not only misconstrued the law, but have afforded advice and information to inventors which have been destructive of their interests. Whatever may be the final result, should the question be carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States, the only safe course now to be followed by inventors, will be for them carefully to abstain from making any sale before completing their applications in the office.

Since the foregoing was written a further communication has been received from New York, written by a gentleman of the Bar, from which it appears that Judge NELSON charged the jury that the patent was equally avoided by the sale of the stove, on the part of the applicant, after he had completed his application, prior to the issuing of the patent. It is not intended, in the present communication, to enter into any argument respecting the correctness of the instructions given to the jury by the Court. It frequently happens that months and sometimes years elapse between the time of making the application and the completion of the grant. In the case of Wilson's patent, this had extended to full three years, and during this period a number of his stoves had been sold. It is not known to the writer that a legal decision adverse to the safety of so selling had been ever made in our courts. The instructions given by the Patent Office and the words of the patent law, as well as many decisions under the act of 1793, and that now in force, have quieted the minds of inventors respecting their right to make sales after their application, were before the office; but now all is uncertainty, even on this point, and the validity of a large proportion of the existing patents put in jeopardy.

T. P. J.

The Purser of the United States frigate "Macedonian" has sent to the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury \$451.23, which sum was subscribed on board that ship, while on her late cruise, for the benefit of the widows and orphans of those who were lost in the "Granpeur."

A CHARNOL ROAD.—The process of making such a road is described by a writer in the *Cleveland Herald* as follows: "Timber, from six to eighteen inches thick, is cut twenty-four feet long, and piled up lengthwise in the centre of the road about five feet high, being nine feet wide at the bottom and two at the top, and then covered with straw and earth in the manner of a caisson. The earth required to cover the pile, taken from either side, leaves two good-sized ditches, and the timber, although not split, is easily charred, and when charred, the earth is removed to the side of the ditches, the coal raked down to a width of fifteen feet, leaving it two feet thick at the centre and one at the sides, and the road is completed."

A road of this kind is now being made in the Cotton Swamp near Bluffville, in Michigan. From the writer above quoted we learn that about seventy rods are completed, twenty of which have been used for the last seven months; and the balance for three months; and as it is on the great thoroughfare West, and as in addition, on an average, sixteen heavy load teams, to and from an ashery, pass over it daily, it has been very well-tried during the winter and spring, and yet there is now no appearance of rut, but it presents an even hard surface.

The Company making the road paid the contractors at the rate of \$660 a mile. The road is said to become very compact, and to be free from mud or dust. Hon. ELMAS WHITTAKER, an engineer who inspected the Bluffville road above mentioned, states that they passed over it the morning after a rain.

At each end of the different sections of the coal road the mud on the causeway was belyed deep, where there was that depth of earth; and nearly every half axle-tree deep where the logs were broken; when on the coal road there was not the least water standing, and the feet of a horse passing rapidly over it was like that made on dried washed sand, as the surf recedes, on the shore of the lake. The water is not drained from the ditches, and yet there are no ruts or inequalities in the surface of the coal road, except what is produced by more compact packing on the line of travel. We think it is probable that coal will fully compensate for the deficiency of limestone and gravel in many sections of the West, and where a road is to be constructed through forest land, that coal may be used at a fourth of the expense of limestone."

MONS. SCIENTIFIC WORDS.—Wilmer's New Letter states that of an announcement in the *Mechanics' Magazine* of the 12th ultimo of a plan, invented by Mr. W. H. James, for the rapid transmission of letters and light dispatches through tubular passages, at certain intervals, in which he proposes to place air-exhausting machines, which will establish a perpetual current of air, and by means of which, by placing special elastic vehicles, or bags, will be blown at inconceivable speed from station to station. The first cost is estimated by Mr. James at £3,000 per mile, and the working expenses at £200 to £500 per annum for every fifty miles. It is alleged that a wonderful engine, called the air-engine, has lately been constructed by Professor Reinga, who is a scientific genius in every civilized country of the earth. The power, which is self-produced in the engine, is obtained from condensed air, which, though easily manageable, begets an immense force, the present engine, which stands on a space not exceeding two feet square, having a power equal to five hundred and sixty-eight horses. For pumping water out of mines it is greatly proposed to use a ten thousand to twenty thousand horse-power, in order to do the work promptly. It is stated that, with the present small engine, two hundred and twenty tons can be propelled at a rate of twenty-five to thirty miles per hour. The description of the action of the machine is very vague, but it is said to be very simple and easy to operate. Professor Faraday, having seen the drawing, and heard the theory and practice of this invention explained, complimented the inventor by declaring that he had discovered perpetual motion of the most terrific description.

ON STEAM NAVIES.

FROM A LONDON PAPER OF APRIL 7.

The subject of the efficiency of our navy, at all times of high consequence, is at the present moment of special interest and of vital importance. After a peace of thirty years, as Sir Charles Napier truly observed in the discussion the other evening on the state of the navy, we ought to be able to show, not merely our countrymen but foreigners also, the progress we have made in the art of ship-building. That the system we have hitherto pursued in building ships is vitious, will be apparent from the following graphic and characteristic passage from the speech of the gallant member for Marylebone:

"With respect to the Queen, it appeared that she was very nearly half built, as the Royal Frederick, before she was changed. But she had failed. She had been since taken into Chatham dock-yard, where a false bow had been stuck on to her. A large gripe, making her four or five feet longer, was added to her bow, but that not being sufficient, she had actually got to be a false stern on, as it was found that she could not steer. She had actually got a bustle on. [Laughter.] So much for the Queen. [Renewed laughter.] He would next come to the Boscawen. She was laid down in 1814 as a seventy-four, but in 1819 she was changed into an 80-gun ship, and in 1824, during the year's seasoning, she was altered into a 70-gun vessel. The Union, after laying out £13,000 in repairs upon her, was pulled to pieces. The Station, 46; Tigris, 48; Jason, 46; Severn, 46; Porcupine, 20; Pheasant, 18; Redwing, 18; Seascope, 10; and Indivictible, were also all pulled to pieces. If the same accident happened to the present Government which occurred to their predecessors, and if a new surveyor of the navy were got, it was quite possible that as many vessels now in service would be also pulled to pieces. Independent of that enormous number of ships, they had the following three-deckers building: The Royal Albert, built after the plan of Mr. Loring. When the present surveyor came into the year's seasoning, she was altered to those who complained to him that they had already gone to too great length in their three-deckers, and yet the Royal Albert was built one foot broader and sixteen feet longer than the Queen. He had that fact from the builder, who, perhaps, might have led him into error. Now, when they considered the enormous mass of timber which was attached to the yard where, he would ask, were they to get men to work them? [Hear, hear.] Really, when he saw a man on one of the lower yards of a three-decker, he could not imagine how he was able to do any thing whatever. It would almost appear that they intended to give the vessel a return for seawater, as it was said that fellows there had a headless man or two between their eyes. [Laughter.] The other ships of the line building were, Royal Frederick, 110; Victoria, 110; Prince of Wales, 110; Royal Sovereign, 110. Ordered: Marlborough, 110; Windsor Castle, 110. Two-deckers, Princess Royal, 90; Aboukir, 90; Exmouth, 90; Hamilton, 90; St. Jean d'Acre, 90; Algiers, 90, all laid down by Mr. Symonds. These made altogether thirteen large ships from 90 up to 110 guns, besides which they had another pretty list of seven 80-gun ships building; all laid down after the plan of Sir W. Symonds. They were all commenced by the late Government, and were as follows: Colossus, 80; Colossus, 80; Madras, Brunswick, Sanspareil. He was not prepared to attach the same blame to the 80-gun ships as to the Royal Albert and the Queen, as he believed it was beyond doubt that the Vanguard was an uncommonly fine vessel. She had certainly the fault of not having a single gun at the stern. He did not know whether the blame of that was to be attached to the late Board of Admiralty or not; but it was extraordinary that the surveyor should propose twelve years ago to construct a ship that had not a single gun at her stern, and that could not fire a shot if chased by a French vessel of superior power. It was ten times worse to build such a ship at the present day, and yet they had the Queen unable to fire a single gun at her stern bows. He trusted, however, that the gallant admiral would be able to tell them that he had changed that rule, and that no other vessels would be built with this serious omission. They had also three 80-gun ships ordered: The Agamemnon, laid down by Admiral Hayn; Irestidale, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Queen, laid down by the late Board of Admiralty. The next class of vessels were the 50-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late government, the Constance, laid down by Sir W. Symonds; and the Raleigh, by Mr. Fincham. In addition to these they had ordered the Severn 50, Fincham; Leader 50, Blake; Spanish 50, Lister; and the Queen, laid down by the late Government. The next class of vessels were the 36-gun frigates, of which two were building: one commenced by the late